arXiv:1210.7258v1 [math.LO] 26 Oct 2012

Analysis of scales in $Lp^{\Sigma}(\mathbb{R})$

Nam Trang
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Berkeley, CA, 94720 USA
http://math.berkeley.edu/∼namtrang
namtrang@math.berkeley.edu.

October 30, 2012

1 Scales analysis in $K^{\Sigma}(\mathbb{R})$

Our official definition of $K^{\Sigma}(\mathbb{R})$ can be found in [1]. In general the scale analysis is independent of specific definitions of $K^{\Sigma}(\mathbb{R})$. The language $\mathcal{L}$ for Σ-premice over $\mathbb{R}$ is just $\mathcal{L}^* \cup \{S\}$ where $\mathcal{L}^*$ is the language for $\mathbb{R}$-premice used in [3] and S is a binary predicate whose intended interpretation is some strategy (in this case, a part of the strategy for $\mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp}$).

We'll use the HOD_{Σ} analysis outlined in the previous section and game theoretic techniques to prove

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a passive, countably iterable Σ-premouse over $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ and suppose $\mathcal{M} \vDash AD$. Then $\mathcal{M} \vDash$ "the pointclass $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}}$ has the scale property."*

Definition 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be Σ-premice over some set X (here we don't assume $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ satisfy choice). We write $\mathcal{M} \prec_1 \mathcal{N}$ iff $\mathcal{M}$ is an initial segment of $\mathcal{N}$ and whenever $\psi(v_1, ..., v_n)$ is a Σ_1 formula of the language $\mathcal{L}$ in which $\dot{F}, \dot{\mu}, \dot{\nu}$, and $\dot{\gamma}$ do not occur then for any $a_1, ..., a_n \in X \cup \{X\}$,*

$$\mathcal{N} \vDash \psi[a_1, ..., a_n] \Rightarrow \mathcal{M} \vDash \psi[a_1, ..., a_n].$$

Definition 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Σ-premouse over some set X and suppose $\omega\alpha \leq \omega\beta \leq o(\mathcal{M})$. We call the interval $[\alpha, \beta]$ a Σ_1-gap of $\mathcal{M}$ iff*

1. $\mathcal{M}|\alpha \prec_1 \mathcal{M}|\beta$*,*

2. $\forall\gamma < \alpha(\mathcal{M}|\gamma \not\prec_1 \mathcal{M}|\alpha)$*,*

3. $\forall\gamma > \beta(\mathcal{M}|\beta \not\prec_1 \mathcal{M}|\gamma)$*.*

We define strong and weak gaps just as in [3] but here types are in the language $\mathcal{L}$. Here are the two main theorems regarding the scale pattern at the end of gaps.

Theorem 1.4. *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a countably 0-iterable* Σ*-mouse over* $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ *which satisfies AD. Let* $[\alpha, \beta]$ *be a strong* Σ_1*-gap of* $\mathcal{M}$ *such that* $\omega\beta < o(\mathcal{M})$*; then*

(a) there is a $\Pi_1^{\mathcal{M}|\alpha}$ *relation on* $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ *which has no uniformization which is definable over* $\mathcal{M}|\beta$*, and hence*

(b) $\mathcal{M}$ *believes that none of the pointclasses* $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{M}|\beta}$ *or* $\Pi_n^{\mathcal{M}|\beta}$ *have the scale property.*

Hence, at the end of strong gaps $[\alpha, \beta]$, the scale property first reappers with the pointclass $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}|(\beta+1)}$. For the weak gap case, we prove the analogue of Theorem 0.1 in [4].

Theorem 1.5. *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a countably* ω*-iterable* Σ*-mouse over* $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ *which satisfies AD and* $[\alpha, \beta]$ *is a weak gap of* $\mathcal{M}$ *(*β *may be* $o(\mathcal{M})$*). Suppose* $\Gamma =_{def} \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}|\alpha}$ *is captured by mice with iteration strateies in* $\mathcal{M}|\alpha$*, ie.,* $\forall b \in HC^{\mathcal{M}}(Lp^{\Sigma,\Gamma}(b) \cap \mathcal{P}(b) = C_\Gamma(b))$*. Then we have that* $\mathcal{M}$ *believes that* $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{M}|\beta}$ *has the scale property where* n *is least such that* $\rho_n(\mathcal{M}|\beta) = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$*.*

1.1 Local HOD_Σ analysis

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Σ-premouse over $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{M} \vDash$ "Θ exists." Set $\theta = \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}$. Fix an n_0 such that $\mathcal{M}$ is n_0-sound and $\rho_{n_0}(\mathcal{M}) \geq \theta$. Letting $o(\mathcal{M}) = \omega\gamma_0$, we assume that for all $\langle \xi, k\rangle <_{lex} \langle \gamma_0, n_0\rangle$, $\mathcal{M}|\xi$ is countably k-iterable. Finally, let

$$T^{\mathcal{M}} = \{\langle \phi, \vec{\alpha}\rangle \mid \phi \in \mathcal{L},\ \vec{\alpha} \in^{<\omega} \theta \text{ and } \mathcal{M}|\theta \vDash \phi[\vec{\alpha}]\}.$$

We define $\mathcal{H}$: a Σ-premouse over $T^{\mathcal{M}}$ by the same process as that in [3]. Namely starting at a least λ such that $\mathcal{M}|\lambda \vDash ZF$, we let

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha = \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\theta \cup \{T^{\mathcal{M}}\}).$$

We then do a level-by-level translation of extenders from $\mathcal{M}$ to that of $\mathcal{H}$ and literally feed in the same trees to the $\mathcal{H}$ side from the corresponding levels on the $\mathcal{M}$ side. That this can be done is implicit in the definition of a Σ-premouse over $\mathbb{R}$.

Working in $\mathcal{M}$, we define the Vopenka algebra Vop_ω that adds an enumeration of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ as in [3] but definitions can mention the predicate for the strategy. It's easy to see that $Vop_\omega \in \mathcal{H}_2$. Truth in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}})$ can be reduced to truth in $\mathcal{H}$ via the forcing relation for Vop_ω. Also $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}})$ determines $\mathcal{M}$ by the local definability of the forcing. The local definability of the forcing is also used to show that the reduction of $\mathcal{M}$-truth to $\mathcal{H}$-truth is local. The following is the main theorem, whose proof is just that in [3].

Theorem 1.6. *$\mathcal{H}$ is a Σ-premouse over $T^{\mathcal{M}}$; moreover, for all $k \leq n_0$, $\mathcal{H}$ is k-sound, $\rho_k(\mathcal{H}) = \rho_k(\mathcal{M})$, and $p_k(\mathcal{H}) = p_k(\mathcal{M})\backslash\{\theta\}$.*

From the proof of Theorem 1.6, we see that if $\mathcal{M} \vDash ZF^-$ then

$$x \in \mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow \exists\alpha(\omega\alpha < \omega\gamma_0 \wedge \forall y \in tcl(x) \cup \{x\}(y \in OD_\Sigma^{\mathcal{M}|\alpha})).$$

So $\mathcal{H}$ indeed carries the intended meaning for $HOD_\Sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$. The next theorem relates the iterability of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{M}$. It is the reason we isolate $\mathcal{H}$, which is an important ingredient in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be n_0-sound Σ-premouse over $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{M} \vDash$ "Θ exists." Suppose $\rho_{n_0}(\mathcal{M}) \geq \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{M}|\lambda \vDash ZF$ for some $\lambda \geq \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}$. Suppose $\mathcal{M}|\xi$ is countably k-iterable for all $\langle \xi, k\rangle <_{lex} \langle\gamma_0, n_0\rangle$ such that $\xi \geq \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\omega\gamma_0 = o(\mathcal{M})$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be defined in $\mathcal{M}$ as above. Then for all γ,*

$$\mathcal{H} \textit{ is } (n_0, \gamma)\textit{-iterable} \Rightarrow \mathcal{M} \textit{ is } (n_0, \gamma)\textit{-iterable above } \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}.$$

1.2 The scale property in $K^\Sigma(\mathbb{R})$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix a countable passive, coutably 0-iterable $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$-premouse $\mathcal{M}$. Assume also $\mathcal{M} \vDash AD$ and $o(\mathcal{M}) = \omega\alpha$ where α is a limit ordinal. The case where α is successor is handled by ideas similar to that of the limit case and by considering the $\mathcal{S}$ hierrarchy. See [2] for details.

Let ϕ_0 be a Σ_1 formula in the language $\mathcal{L}$ where we may assume (by the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ is passive) that the constants $\dot{F}, \dot{\mu}, \dot{\nu}, \dot{\gamma}$ for the top extender don't occur in ϕ_0. Hence ϕ_0 can only mention $\dot{\in}, \dot{E}, \dot{\mathbb{R}}, S$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$, let

$$P(x) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \vDash \phi_0[x].$$

We show that $\mathcal{M}$ thinks there is a $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}}$-scale on P.

First let $\alpha^* = \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}$ if $\mathcal{M} \vDash \Theta$ exists; otherwise, let $\alpha^* = o(\mathcal{M})$. Then $\mathcal{P} = \cup_{\beta<\alpha^*} P^\beta$ where for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$,

$$P^\beta(x) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}|\beta \vDash \phi_0[x].$$

For each $\beta < \alpha^*$, we construct a closed game representation $x \mapsto G^\beta_x$ for P^β where G^β_x is a closed game defined below that is continuously associated to x. Let

$$P^\beta_k(x,u) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad u \text{ is a position of length } k \text{ from which player I has a winning quasi-strategy in } G^\beta_x.$$

We will define G^β_x in such a way that $P^\beta_k \in \mathcal{M}$ and the map $\langle \beta, k\rangle \mapsto P^\beta_k$ is $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}}$. This will give us the desired $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}}$ scale.

Fix $\beta < \alpha^*$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$. We want to define G^β_x. The idea of the game is as follows. Player I plays a countable model of "$V = K^\Sigma(\mathbb{R}) + \phi_0(x) + \forall\gamma\ \mathcal{J}_\gamma^{\vec{E},\Sigma}(\mathbb{R}) \nvDash \phi_0[x]$" that contains all reals played by player II. Player I also needs to verify second order facts about his model to prove that he is playing an $\mathcal{N}$ that is an $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$-mouse. Wellfoundedness of $\mathcal{N}$ is verified by embedding $\mathcal{N}$'s ordinals into $\omega\beta$ and iterability of $\mathcal{N}$ is verified by embedding the local HOD_Σ's of $\mathcal{N}$ into the corresponding local HOD_Σ's of $\mathcal{M}|\beta$ under his embedding of ordinals.

The language for the game is that of $\mathcal{L}^* =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{L} \cup \{\dot{x}_i \mid i < \omega\} \cup \{\dot{a}\}$ where the constant symbols $\dot{x}_i$ will denote the i^{th} real played in the game and $\dot{a}$ will denote $\mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp}$. Fix recursive maps

$$m, n : \{\ulcorner\sigma\urcorner \mid \sigma \text{ is an } \mathcal{L}^* - \text{formula}\} \to \{2n \mid 1 \leq n < \omega\}$$

which are one-to-one, have disjoint recursive ranges, and are such that whenever $\dot{x}_i$ occurs in σ, then $i < \min(m(\sigma), n(\sigma))$. For an $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$-premouse $\mathcal{P}$ and $\xi < o(\mathcal{N})$, $\mathcal{P} \vDash \xi$ is relevant iff $\mathcal{P}|\xi \vDash$ "Θ exists, and there is a $\lambda > \Theta$ such that $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^{\dot{E}} \vDash ZF$".

Fix a Σ_1 formula $\sigma_0(v_0, v_1, v_2)$ that uniformly defines the graph of a surjection $h_\gamma : [\omega\gamma]^{<\gamma} \times \mathbb{R} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{M}|\gamma$ over $\mathcal{M}|\gamma$ for each γ. Let T be the following $\mathcal{L}^*$ theory

(1) Extensionality + $V = K^\Sigma(\mathbb{R})$

(2) $\forall v(v \text{ is relevant} \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_v \text{ exists})$

$(3)_\phi$ $\exists v\phi(v) \Rightarrow \exists v(\phi(v) \wedge \forall u \in v \neg\phi(u))$

$(4)_i$ $\dot{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}$

(5) $\phi_0(\dot{x}_0) \wedge \forall\gamma(\mathcal{J}_\gamma^{\dot{E},\Sigma}(\mathbb{R}) \nvDash \phi_0[\dot{x}_0])$

(6) $\forall v_0, v_1, y, z(\sigma_0(v_0, v_1, y) \wedge \phi_0(v_0, v_1, z) \Rightarrow y = z)$

$(7)_\phi$ $\exists v\phi(v) \Rightarrow \exists v\exists F \in [Ord]^{<\omega}(\phi(v) \wedge \sigma_0(F, \dot{x}_{m(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)}, v))$

$(8)_\phi$ $\exists v(\phi(v) \wedge v \in \mathbb{R}) \Rightarrow \phi(\dot{x}_{n(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)})$.

A run of the game G^β_x is of length ω. For each n, player I plays i_n, x_{2n}, η_n where $i_n \in \{0,1\}$,

$x_{2n} \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\eta_n < \omega\beta$ while player II plays $x_{2n+1} \in \mathbb{R}$. If $u = \langle (i_k, x_{2k}, \eta_k, x_{2k+1}) \mid k < n\rangle$ is a partial play of length n, we let

$$T^*(u) = \{\sigma \mid \sigma \text{ is a sentence of } \mathcal{L}^* \wedge i_{n(\ulcorner\sigma\urcorner)} = 0 \wedge n(\sigma) < n\},$$

and if p is a full run of G^β_x,

$$T^*(p) = \bigcup_{n<\omega} T^*(p \restriction n).$$

For notational convenience, we let "$iv\phi(v)$" stand for "the least v such that $\phi(v)$". $p = \langle (i_k, x_{2k}, \eta_k, x_{2k+1}) \mid k < \omega\rangle$ is a winning run for player I iff

(a) $x_0 = (x, \mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp})$,

(b) $T^*(p)$ is a complete consistent extension of T and for all $i, m, n < \omega$, "$\dot{x}_i(n) = m$" $\in T^*(p)$ iff $x_i(n) = m$,

(c) "$\varphi \in \dot{a}$"$\in T^*(p)$ iff $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp}$,

(d) if ϕ and ψ are $\mathcal{L}^*$-formulae with one free variable and "$iv\phi(v) \in \mathrm{Ord} \wedge iv\psi(v) \in \mathrm{Ord}$"$\in T^*(p)$, then "$iv\phi(v) \leq iv\psi(v)$"$\in T^*(p)$ iff $\eta_{n(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)} \leq \eta_{n(\ulcorner\psi\urcorner)}$,

(e) if ψ is an $\mathcal{L}^*$-formula with one free variable and "$iv\psi(v) \in \mathrm{Ord} \wedge iv\psi(v)$ is relevant"$\in T^*(p)$, then $\eta_{n(\ulcorner\psi\urcorner)}$ is relevant in $\mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, if $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$ are $\mathcal{L}^*$-formulae of one free variable such that for all k, "$iv\sigma_k(v) < iv\psi(v)$"$\in T^*(p)$ then for any $\mathcal{L}$-formula $\theta(v_1, \ldots, v_n)$,

$$\text{“}\mathcal{H}_{iv\psi(v)} \vDash \theta[iv\sigma_1(v), \ldots, iv\sigma_n(v)]\text{”} \in T^*(p)$$

if and only if

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{M}}_{\eta_{n(\ulcorner\psi\urcorner)}} \vDash \theta[\eta_{n(\ulcorner\sigma_1\urcorner)}, \ldots, \eta_{n(\ulcorner\sigma_n\urcorner)}].$$

We now define the notion of *honesty* and show that player I wins if and only if he is honest. More precisely, we say a position $u = \langle (i_k, x_{2k}, \eta_k, x_{2k+1}) \mid k < n\rangle$ is (β, x)-**honest** iff $\mathcal{M}|\beta \vDash \phi_0[x]$ and letting $\gamma \leq \beta$ be the least such that $\mathcal{M}|\gamma \vDash \phi_0[x]$, we have

(i) $n > 0 \Rightarrow x_0 = (x, \mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp})$,

(ii) if we interpret $\dot{x}_i$ as x_i for $0 < i < 2n$ and $(\dot{x_0}, \dot{a})$ as x_0 then all axioms of $T^*(u) \cup T$ as interpreted in $(\mathcal{M}|\gamma, I_u)$ are true there where I_u is the aforementioned interpretation, and

(iii) if $\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_m$ enumerate $\mathcal{L}^*$-formulae σ of one free variable such that $n(\ulcorner\sigma\urcorner) < n$ and

$$(\mathcal{M}|\gamma, I_u) \vDash iv\sigma(v) \in \mathrm{Ord},$$

and if $\delta_i < \omega\gamma$ such that

$$(\mathcal{M}|\gamma, I_u) \vDash iv\sigma(v) = \delta_i,$$

then the map

$$\delta_i \mapsto \eta_{n(\ulcorner\sigma_i\urcorner)}$$

is well-defined and extendible to an order preserving map $\pi : \omega\gamma \to \omega\beta$ such that whenever δ_i is relevent in $\mathcal{M}$ then $\pi|\omega\delta_i$ is extendible to an elementary embedding from $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{M}}_{\delta_i}$ to $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{M}}_{\eta_{n(\ulcorner\sigma_i\urcorner)}}$. Here we note that elements in $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{M}}_{\delta_i}$ are definable from ordinals in $\omega\delta_i$ since our language involves the predicate S for the strategy of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp}$.

The following two claims complete our proof of theorem 1.1. The proof of these claims is similar to that of claims 4.2, 4.3 in [3].

Claim 1. Letting $Q^\beta_k(x, u)$ iff u is a (β, x)-honest position of length k, we have that $Q^\beta_k \in \mathcal{M}$ for all β, and the map $(\beta, k) \mapsto Q^\beta_k$ is $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}}$.

Claim 2. For any position u in G^β_x, player I has a winning quasi-strategy starting from u iff u is (β, x)-honest, ie., $P^\beta_k(x, u) \Leftrightarrow Q^\beta_k(x, u)$ for all k.

We now move on to the proof of Theorem 1.4. We give a proof using mouse capturing because it's not clear to us that Martin's reflection theorem (for the inductive pointclass) obviously generalizes to other inductive-like pointclasses (like Σ_1 of the strong gap). A careful look at the proof shows that it actually implies Martin's reflection theorem in our situation. Theorem 1.4 combined with Theorem 1.1 imply that the scale pattern first reappears at the pointclass $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}|(\beta+1)}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Fix the strong gap $[\alpha, \beta]$ in $\mathcal{M}$ where $\beta < o(\mathcal{M})$. Let $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}|\alpha}$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha(x, y) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists\gamma < \alpha\ \{y\} \text{ is } OD^{\mathcal{M}|\gamma}(x).$$

It's easily seen that $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}|\alpha}$. Hence $\neg\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is $\Pi_1^{\mathcal{M}|\alpha}$. We claim that $\neg\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ has no uniformization in $\mathcal{M}|(\beta + 1)$. The key to this proof is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose $A \in OD^{\mathcal{M}|\beta} \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. Then there is a Γ-suitable premouse $\mathcal{N}$ that* *locally captures A.*

Remark: In fact, more is true. We can take $\mathcal{N}$ in the theorem to be A-iterable for normal nondropping trees but we don't need this.

Without loss of generality, suppose $R \in OD^{\mathcal{M}|\beta}(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a uniformization of $\neg\mathcal{C}_\alpha$. Let y be the unique real such that $R(x,y)$. Hence $\{y\} \in OD^{\mathcal{M}|\beta}(x)$ hence is locally captured by a Γ-suitable premouse $\mathcal{N}$ over x. But this implies $y \in \mathcal{N}$ hence $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(x,y)$. Contradiction. This completes the proof of theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. There are many cases to consider. We only consider one case where $\mathcal{M}$ is active of type II, $\beta = o(\mathcal{M})$, and $\rho_1(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{R}$. Let F be the top extender of $\mathcal{M}$ with critical point κ and $\widetilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma^{1,\mathcal{M}}_{\langle G,w_1\rangle}$ be our nonreflecting Σ_1-type where $G \in ORD^{<\omega}$ and $w_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. We may assume G is the Kleene-Brouwer least H such that $\langle H, w_1\rangle$ realizes a nonreflecting Σ_1-type. Finally, let $\theta = \Theta^{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let $\beta_0 = \nu(\dot{F}^{\mathcal{M}})$ = the sup of generators of F. Suppose $\beta_i < \beta$ is defined, let

$$Y_i = \{a \mid a \text{ is definable over } \mathcal{M}||\beta_i{}^1 \text{ from parameters in } \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{G, \beta_0, \dots, \beta_{i-1}\}\},$$

and

$$\xi_i = \sup(Y_i \cap (\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}}).$$

Let ψ_i be the least formula ψ in $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ such that $\mathcal{M}||\beta_i \nvDash \phi[\langle G, w_1\rangle]$. Let β_{i+1} be the least $\overline{\beta} > \beta_i$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}||\overline{\beta} \vDash \psi_i[\langle G, w_1\rangle] + \dot{F}^{\mathcal{M}||\overline{\beta}} \text{ is total on } \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{\mathcal{M}|\xi_i} + V = K^{\Sigma}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Because of our specific definition of Σ-mousehood, the last clause in the above equation should be interpreted as $\mathcal{M}||\overline{\beta}$ is closed under Λ, where Λ is the strategy for $\mathcal{M}_1^{\Sigma,\sharp}$. Recall that the predicate S records a suitable fragment of Λ and the statement "$V = K^{\Sigma}(\mathbb{R})$" can be expressed in the language $\mathcal{L}^*$.

By the same proof as that of Claim 4.18 in [3], we get

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{i<\omega} Y_i.$$

This implies $\sup(\{\beta_i \mid i < \omega\}) = \beta$ and $\sup(\{\xi_i \mid i < \omega\}) = (\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}}$. Fix uniformly $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}||\beta_i}(G, w_1)$ (in the language $\mathcal{L}$, of course) surjective maps $f_i : \mathbb{R} \twoheadrightarrow Y_i$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ let $\sigma_i^x = 0$ if $f_i(x) \not<_{KB} G$ and $=$ least $\sigma \in \widetilde{\Sigma}$ such that $\mathcal{M}||\beta_i \nvDash \sigma[\langle f_i(x), w_1\rangle]$ otherwise. Let $h_i(x) = 0$ if $f_i(x) \not<_{KB} G$ or σ_i^x is Σ_1 and $=$ least $k \geq i$ such that $\mathcal{M}||\beta_k \vDash \neg\sigma_i^x[\langle f_i(x), w_1\rangle]$ otherwise. Then for some $w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$, uniformly in i, the functions $h_i, x \mapsto \sigma_i^x$ are $\Sigma_2^{\mathcal{M}|\beta_i}(G, w_1, w_2)$. This uses the coding lemma applied to sets in $\mathcal{M}|\theta$, $\beta_i > \theta$, and the fact that the transitive collapses of the Y_i are in $\mathcal{M}|\theta$.

Now let $\mathcal{L}^{**}$ be an extension of $\mathcal{L}$ that describes $\mathcal{M}$ as the union of the Y_i. $\mathcal{L}^{**}$ consists of the extra constant symbols $\{\dot{w}_1, \dot{w}_2, \dot{G}, (\dot{\mathcal{M}}_k, \dot{\beta}_k \mid k < \omega)\}$. Let B_0 be the set of Σ_0 formulae in $\mathcal{L}^{**}$. Let

$$S_0 = \{\phi \in B_0 \mid \phi \text{ is a sentence and } \mathcal{M} \vDash \phi\}.$$

We say a formula $\phi \in B_0$ has support m if it can only refer to $\{\dot{w}_1, \dot{w}_2, \dot{G}, (\dot{\mathcal{M}}_k, \dot{\beta}_k \mid k < m)\}$. Let

$$S_m = \{\langle \phi, x_1, \ldots, x_k\rangle \mid \phi \in B_0 \text{ has support } m \wedge \mathcal{M} \vDash \phi[x_1, \ldots, x_k]\}.$$

Note that $\forall i \exists \gamma < \beta$ S_i is $OD^{\mathcal{M}|\gamma}(w_1, w_2)$. Once we isolate the S_i. We can proceed as in [4] to get the desirable scale.

References

[1] Grigor Sargsyan. A tale of hybrid mice, available at http://math.rutgers.edu/∼gs481/.

[2] John R. Steel. Scales in L(ℝ). In *Cabal seminar 79–81*, volume 1019 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 107–156. Springer, Berlin, 1983.

[3] John R. Steel. Scales in **K**(ℝ). In *Games, scales, and Suslin cardinals. The Cabal Seminar. Vol. I*, volume 31 of *Lect. Notes Log.*, pages 176–208. Assoc. Symbol. Logic, Chicago, IL, 2008.

[4] John R. Steel. Scales in $K(\mathbb{R})$ at the end of a weak gap. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 73(2):369–390, 2008.